

**CMER Meeting
July 17, 2003
NWIFC Conference Center
DRAFT Minutes**

Attendees:

Brandt, Karrie	DNR
Butts, Sally	USFWS
Clark, Jeffrey	Weyerhaeuser
Dominquez, Larry	DNR
Ehinger, Bill	Department of Ecology
Franjulien, Yasmine	Visitor, accompanied Larry Dominquez
Glass, Domoni	Glass Environmental
Jackson, Terry	WDFW
MacCracken, Jim	Longview Fibre
Martin, Doug	CMER co-chair, Martin Environmental
McDonald, Dennis	DNR
McFadden, George	NWIFC
McNaughton, Geoff	AMPA, DNR
Mendoza, Chris	ARC Environmental Consultants
Pavel, Joseph	NWIFC
Peterson, Pete	Upper Columbia United Tribes
Pleus, Allen	NWIFC
Price, Dave	WDFW
Pucci, Dawn	Suquamish Tribe
Quinn, Tim	CMER co-chair, WDFW
Risenhoover, Ken	Port Blakely
Rowe, Blake	Longview Fibre
Rowton, Heather	WFPA
Schuett-Hames, Dave	NWIFC
Smitch, Curt	Thompson Consulting Group
Stringer, Angela	Campbell Group
Sturhan, Nancy	DNR

Summary of Decisions and Tasks

Decision/Task	Section of Minutes
▪ June CMER minutes approved as submitted.	Minutes
▪ Quinn and Martin will approach the policy co-chairs about how to contest the 3% overhead now being charged by the IAC.	Budget Update
▪ McNaughton will distribute a budget sheet depicting funds	

<p>allocated by project and under contract at the next CMER Meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments on the budget are due 7/25. Following the comment period, Quinn, Martin and McNaughton will meet to incorporate final revisions and prepare the budget for policy distribution on 8/7. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approval for LWAG reallocation of \$35,000 from the Seeps project to the Sampling project. All future requests for reallocation between SAG projects will be brought to CMER in the form of SAG requests. CMER staffing costs are not action items for CMER; these decisions are made at the Policy and FPB level. 	SAG Requests
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Marcus Johns will be asked to attend the next CMER meeting. 	Compliance monitoring
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schuett-Hames or McFadden will convene a group to craft a CMER vision and determine how CMER can best communicate ideas to the SRF Board during the concept proving phase of the intensive watershed monitoring effort. 	Intensive Monitoring Update
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The August CMER meeting is cancelled unless it is determined that a meeting is necessary. CMER participants are asked to hold September 18th and September 19th for a potential two-day CMER meeting. The September Science topic is undecided. 	CMER Meetings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CMER manual development prioritized Review committees identified for some chapters Work groups to form for chapters needing more detailed analysis before drafting can occur CMER approved a PSMWG request for up to \$20,000 for a technical writer. 	Afternoon Session
<p>Items for Consideration by Policy at the 8/7/03 meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> \$450,000 Type N Buffer 2nd year funding Funding for the next year's RMZ study \$20,000 for a technical writer \$100,000 for project development fund \$35,000 for LWAG sampling and seeps if CMER agrees to the request via the e-mail distribution Revised CMER Budget 	Afternoon Session

Minutes and Action Items: Minutes from the June CMER meeting were approved as amended. Action Items were reviewed.

Budget Update: the budget sheet has been reformatted to mirror the CMER workplan more closely; this change in format was requested by the Policy, and CMER provided comments on the current draft. The state general fund has been slightly re-allocated. The

federal allocation has also been reduced by \$38,000. Additionally, the IAC is now proposing 3% overhead for future IAC contracts. This increase totals \$122,000; Quinn and Martin will approach the Policy co-chairs to discuss objecting to this overhead charge. \$372,500 has been allocated to the small landowner office for the next biennium. An additional \$100,000 was allocated for development of a small landowner spatial database relating to the 20-acre exemption.

MacCracken said that some of the figures for LWAG projects are not accurate and he will work with McNaughton to clarify this. MacCracken also suggested two budget sheets (one by program and one by project which would include only those projects that are under contract). McNaughton said that there is a budget sheet that reflects projects currently under contract along with the amount spent. CMER expressed an interest in reviewing this more detailed budget sheet and McNaughton will distribute it at the next CMER meeting. Pleus suggested that the budget sheet should show clear differentiation between approved spending and projected funding as well as amounts that are under contract and those that are not.

Revisions to the Budget Sheet: Policy will receive this budget sheet at the 8/7 meeting. Comments from SAGs on this budget are due by 7/25. Quinn, Martin and McNaughton will then meet and revise the budget for Policy.

SAG Requests:

PSMWG: the group requested \$20,000 from project development funds to contract a technical writer for the Protocols and Standards Manual. Martin suggested that this request be postponed until the end of the afternoon session and CMER agreed.

LWAG: Comments were made that looking at a request from LWAG at this time would not be appropriate given that SAG requests are to be out one week in advance. Discussion ensued and consensus was reached as follows:

CMER Consensus: SAG reallocations from one project to another should be treated as SAG requests. A CMER SAG request will be drafted for the \$35,000 that LWAG is seeking. This request will be routed through e-mail to CMER participants; if there are no objections to the request, it will be considered approved.

Additionally, LWAG requested to reallocate \$35,000 from the Seeps Project to the Sampling project.

	<u>Sampling</u>	<u>Seeps</u>
Board Approved		150,000 (lumped projects)
CMER Approved	95,000	90,000
Reallocation request	130,000	55,000

This results in an additional need, to be requested at a later time, for \$35,000.

CMER Consensus: CMER will allow LWAG in this case to allocate money as they see fit as it was approved at a program level (\$150,000). All future requests for reallocation between SAG projects will be brought to CMER in the form of a SAG request.

CMER Staff Update: \$340,000 is presently approved for funding four CMER staff positions. \$33,360 additional funding is requested for next year to cover additional costs including salaries, travel, vehicles, training, supplies, equipment, and indirect charges.

Indirect overhead is charged by the Commission.

CMER Consensus: This is not an action item for CMER but updates are appreciated. Decisions on CMER staff funding allocations are made at the Policy and FPB level.

SRC Update: The SRC review of the Joan Sias report has been completed. Preliminary UPSAG review indicates that we received a very high quality review from the SRC. Concerning other reviews: ISAG had delays in a couple of projects and the reviewers had to cancel out as a result. WETSAG was planning to take a literature review to the SRC as well and experienced delays which almost cost them reviewers as well; that report is currently under review. Only the document has been submitted at this time. The formal review has not been initiated because formal questions have not been developed and submitted.

Instead of treating all reviews similarly; CMER has said that there are some reviews that are time sensitive and reviewers should be identified in advance. In these cases, SAGs are to identify that the review is time sensitive and then must meet the agreed upon deadlines. The reviews that are not time sensitive should be submitted with the understanding that it will take more than 8 weeks for the review because the university will need to identify reviewers.

Concern was expressed that CMER review of the wetlands report has not yet started.

Compliance Monitoring: Schroff is not able to join CMER today but he did update the co-chairs and AMPA on progress made to complete the compliance monitoring protocol. Development of the protocol plan outline has been delayed to October 31st 2003. Monitoring is scheduled to start in January 2004. Marcus Johns has transferred from the Small Landowner office to the FP operations division and 80% of his time is dedicated toward developing the compliance monitoring protocol. Early Priorities include: road maintenance and construction, RMZs establishment and activities in the RMZ, stream crossings, and special conditioning of permits.

Potential areas where DNR will need CMER help are: identifying areas of interest, assisting in coordination of efforts, assisting in the technical development of the program, review of the quantitative numeric data methodology and qualitative compliance rating

methodology and dissemination of information during the development and implementation of marketing.

CMER expressed concerned with a lack of stakeholder outreach efforts and hopes to get more involved in development of the protocol.

Marcus Johns will be invited to the next CMER meeting.

Workplan Schedule: One item (a progress report to policy) was added to the workplan schedule. The workplan schedule will be dated so that readers can easily determine what the most recent version is.

Intensive Monitoring Watershed (IMW): Ehinger updated CMER that on July 2, 2003 the SRF Board agreed to fund the intensive monitoring request for IMW-1, Option 1 at \$900,000. There are several components: 1) continue smolt monitoring; 2) additional smolt monitoring and 3) assessment of potential candidate IWM; and 4) study and implementation plan development. Recommendations on governance structure will be made at a higher level as it affects the state on a whole and may have legislative implications.

There is no need for additional CMER money this year. When the contract is signed, interested organizations will need to be identified and approached for involvement.

CMER should discuss how we to communicate with the SRF Board as they determine how governance issues will be resolved. Glass suggested CMER working together to formulate a vision for the SRF Board to consider as the concept proving continues. Collaboration among SAGs is needed to get this off the ground. Quinn said that he talked with Heide about approaching landowners and they are working to draft a letter and will then meet with landowners in the basin.

CMER Consensus: Schuett-Hames or McFadden will convene a group to craft a CMER vision and determine how CMER can best communicate ideas to the SRF Board during the concept proving phase of the intensive watershed monitoring effort.

SAG Issues:

There were no SAG issues to discuss.

CMER Meetings: The August meeting is cancelled unless it is determined that there is a need to meet. CMER participant are asked to hold September 18th and 19th for a potential two-day CMER meeting. The science topic for September is undecided.

Afternoon Session

CMER Protocols and Standards Manual development was prioritized as follows:

- Priority 1: Chapter 5, 6, and 7 and work to begin in small groups on Chapters 9, 11, and 12.
- Priority 2: Chapters 1, 3, 4
- Priority 3: Dispute Resolution

The following Review Committees were formed to review work on Chapters:

- Chapter 1 still in committee
- Chapter 2 still in committee
- Chapter 3 still in committee
- Chapter 4 Sturhan
- Chapter 5 Martin
- Chapter 6 Price, McNaughton, Sturhan, Peterson, Jackson
- Chapter 7 McNaughton, McDonald, Heckel

Workgroups for Chapters 9, 10 and 11.

Chapter 9: there is an existing work group. Rowton will call a meeting.

Chapters 10 and 11: Rowton will identify committee members with the proper expertise and will update CMER when the committee is formed

PSMWG: the group requested \$20,000 of project development funds to contract a technical writer for the Protocols and Standards Manual.

Quinn suggested pursuing this contract in two increments of \$10,000 and hinging the second phase on successful completion of the first phase. There was also support for this position being broader as it will require both writing expertise and the ability to work with a collaborative forum. The committee will have discussions about what skill set is necessary and will consult with Sturhan, McNaughton, and Quinn.

CMER Consensus: CMER approved the SAG request as drafted; the successful contractor will be paid by the hour and if it appears that they will be unable to complete the work the contract will be terminated.

CMER Consensus: An additional \$100,000 will requested for the project development fund.

Items for Consideration by Policy at the 8/7/03 meeting.

- \$450,000 Type N Buffer
- funding for the next year's RMZ study
- \$20,000 for a technical writer

- \$100,000 for project development fund
- \$35,000 for LWAG sampling and seeps if CMER agrees to the request via the e-mail request
- Revised CMER Budget